explained that the State, in light of discussions with the victim, would agree not to proceed with or pursue the mandatory habitual offender petition under 4214(b). Having been advised of that and actually reading the statute to him, I am satisfied that he understands what he is facing, and despite that he has chosen to proceed to trial today.

If there is anything that Mr. Bordley wants to add at this time, I request that he do so to make sure at this stage of the proceedings that the record is absolutely clear as to his desire to proceed to trial without an attorney.

THE COURT: Mr. Bordley, did you hear everything Mr. O'Neill just said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And have you taken into consideration the information that he provided to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I have talked to Mr. Baumeister several times. This case is a year old, and I asked Mr. Baumeister, I wrote him and he said I was never habitual. I asked him several times was I habitual. He said, "No, you are

not. As far as I'm concerned, you are not an habitual." Right?

Ms. Weeks -- the whole time I was coming here,
Andrew Vella kept offering me a plea to the
habitual, which I had a burglary on my record that I
got cleared up. When I came down here Wednesday,
she gave me a plea to a certain amount of time,
wasn't habitual or anything. When I got down here
today, it changed up. It was so fast, they didn't
give me no time to think. They ready to go to
trial. No thinking process.

My whole case has been messed up. I would like Mr. Baumeister to represent me if he's going to represent me right. I have no other choice but to represent myself or go to trial. The pleas he's offering -- it is a domestic dispute. I've been in here a year already for it.

THE COURT: Let me just make sure that I understand that you understand. My understanding from the State is that if you were convicted of the charges by the jury, that you would be subject to a mandatory life term of imprisonment as an habitual

neither was Mr. Vella. We understood that the predicate offenses were a burglary and a delivery charge. I had advised Mr. Vella I had obtained the records, or that Mr. Bordley had given those to me, and checked them out and found he pled guilty to a criminal trespass. \*\*So it was my opinion at the time I was representing Mr. Bordley that he was not eligible for habitual offender treatment.

The new charge, the 1980 charge, was

first brought to my attention this morning. I have

not been representing Mr. Bordley since November, or

actually before that. We had a colloquy with

Judge Ridgely a couple of months ago. Mr. Bordley

was brought into the courtroom and I was ordered to

provide copies of my entire file to Mr. Bordley,

which I did, at the Judge's instruction, and that

has been the end of my assistance to Mr. Bordley,

other than answering technical questions.

And I think it is, in fact, true to say that Mr. Bordley is finding out today for the first time that he has a 1980 charge which might be a predicate offense for the habitual offender conviction. He was offered, again, the same plea

offer that Mr. Vella originally offered.

1.6

However, today, there was a change in the plea offer and the State agreed not to seek habitual offender status, and he would be sentenced under the normal provisions of the burglary first degree statute, which would be a maximum of ten years, and the sentence would be from 48 to 96 months under the truth-in-sentencing. And I believe the 48 months, because of his prior record, is a minimum sentence the Court can impose and he could get up to 96 months -- actually could get up to ten years.

He was offered that plea offer this morning and, quite frankly, in my opinion, he should have taken that. But he is his own attorney, but it seems to me to be quite appropriate. Beyond that, quite frankly, if Mr. Bordley is saying today that he wants me to represent him, that would be all well and good, but I have not prepared this case and I am not prepared to go to trial today.

MR. O'NEILL: If I might supplement what Mr. Baumeister said to the Court, there is a letter dated January 27, 1998, signed by Mr. Vella who was the deputy attorney general in the Kent office at

you could do that. So are you saying that you really don't want to go pro se, that you would prefer to have him represent you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.

fine, but that does present quite a dilemma to me, because I had to let the Judge know this morning that, as of this morning, I also represented the victim. The Judge disqualified me from representing her, but I have not prepared this case, assuming that Mr. Bordley, as has always been his wish, did not want me to assist him, other than rendering technical assistance.

go to trial today. I apologize for that, but I am simply not ready to try this case without further discovery and getting into the meat of the issue.

THE COURT: Well, you are aware, are you not, that when you are stand-by counsel, that really at any particular point in time, if the defendant asks you to resume representing him, that you would do so?

MR. BAUMEISTER: Well, Your Honor, there are some issues in this particular case that need to be examined. I don't know whether Mr. Bordley did that in fact or not; and that would be a past criminal record of Miss Loper, who is the alleged victim here, who has been a public defender client on numerous occasions also, and also her mental status or history at the Delaware State Hospital with admissions. And those records have not been subpoenaed by me. I don't know whether Mr. Bordley subpoenaed those records or not, but I certainly did not.

THE COURT: Well, I note that the case has apparently been pending since January of '98; is that correct?

MR. BAUMEISTER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Does the State have any comments on was apparently a request for continuance?

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Yes, Your Honor. The State would oppose a request for a continuance.

Regarding the victim's records, Elizabeth Loper's, the request for the criminal record, the State could

provide that. We have that here with us. Also, we are going to move for a motion in limine to preclude the defendant from making any mention of Miss Loper's pending charges in this Court. They are not related to this matter in any way.

Also, regarding Miss Loper's State

Hospital status or status as a mental patient, the

State was also going to move today -- or will move

today that the defendant be precluded from bringing

that up in trial as it is not relevant.

MR. BAUMEISTER: Frankly, I do not know what her record is whether a motion in limine is appropriate or not. Her mental status may go greatly to the issue of credibility, and until I've seen those records, I do not know.

MR. JONES: Your Honor, if I may be heard with respect to the first aspect of the State's motion of limine. I have been appointed just this morning to represent Mrs. Loper in respect to the criminal charges on which Mr. Baumeister was excused as counsel so that he could be stand-by counsel for Mr. Bordley. I've advised her and discussed with the prosecution that those charges are unrelated to

this case; that if Ms. Loper is asked questions about those charges, she intends to exercise her privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment.

I'm not a party to this proceeding, Your Honor, so I can't take a position on whether or not questioning with regard to those unrelated pending charges is relevant or not to either impeachment or any issue in this case, but I need to inform the Court, as her counsel as of now, that she'll not answer any questions with respect to her pending criminal charges pursuant to her rights under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BAUMETSTER: Your Honor, it does create a problem with the Office of the Public Defender, because we have represented her in the past, and up until this morning were representing her on unrelated charges. But I'm still concerned about conflict situation here.

As stand-by counsel, it seems different than actually sitting in the seat, the driver's seat for the defendant. So I'm going to need to check

THE DEFENDANT: Not this occurrence. But it helps to establish the process of this case. She tells me one thing but tells the cops another thing.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think there's anything I can do about that today, so I think the request for a continuance is denied. Now, is there anything further you would like to say right now?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

other matter with you. I notice that you have the prison clothing on. If you have civilian clothes with you, you can wear them. I just want to let you know that if you have civilian clothes with you, you are welcome to wear them.

THE DEFENDANT: I got my prison clothes at the prison. But when I came down here Wednesday, Mr. Baumeister said it was for my trial, I was going to get dressed this morning, but Mr. Baumeister was not 100 percent sure, but he said my trial would probably not get started because other people were going to trial, and that's the reason I didn't wear my clothes. I wanted to change this morning, that's the only time you can change.

are trying to offer me ten years for something I see other people get things for, I might as well go to trial. That's the way I look at it.

MR. BAUMEISTER: Your Honor, according to this, I was just given a copy of the victim's print-out of her record. She was admitted to the Delaware State Hospital as a mental patient on the 14th day of April of this year. I need to see, I want the State to provide me with the State Hospital records. I think I will make that application orally.

If they have not been subpoenaed, I'm demanding that the State provide them to me right now, because she has one, two, three -- at least three mandatory commitments to the Delaware State Hospital as a mental patient on her criminal record, and I think that does go to her credibility, Your Honor. So I want those records before I start making my opening remarks today.

THE COURT: Would the State care to respond to that?

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Yes, Your Honor. That is privileged information and the State can review

review a person's psychiatric records.

THE COURT: I agree with that.

MR. O'NETLL: I think what the proper course is for the State to obtain the record, review them and provide them to the Court to review in camera; and for any purposes of appeal, the Court can seal those records, if the Court believes there's something to be turned over to the defense, and seal them for the Supreme Court later down the line. But Mr. Baumeister, I don't think, can stand up here and say he gets to review these records. I don't believe that's the proper course of dealing in this area.

MR. BAUMEISTER: Well, Your Honor, -THE COURT: I'm listening.

MR. BAUMEISTER: -- the issue would be her competence to testify in court. I'm not sure what to say about that, until those records, at least, have been reviewed. When I see on someone's criminal record three commitments to the Delaware State Hospital, there has to be an issue of competence. If she were a defendant -- and she is a defendant in this Court, and our office has

hear from somebody who has been admitted to the State Hospital and use that to impeach her credibility. People are admitted to the State Hospital for numerous reasons.

There are people who are depressed and they need professional help. Not everybody admitted to the State Hospital is a paranoid schizophrenic as Mr. Baumeister is suggesting. So until that point in time, I think the defense should be barred from mentioning anything about her be admitted to the State Hospital.

The State will acquire those records, review them and turn them over to the Court so the Court can review them as well. If there is something that may constitute Brady material, of course, in light of our duty, we will turn those over to the defense. But we will acquire the records and turn them over to the Court.

THE COURT: You can acquire them and review them first, and we will go from there. It is quarter of 12:00. We will come back at quarter to 1:00. We will be in recess.

\* \* \* \* \*

real comfortable of reviewing the records myself, because of the doctor - patient confidentiality.

The State would prefer to turn the records over to Your Honor for review of anything that may be discoverable in this case.

MR. BAUMEISTER: I'm also concerned, frankly, as you know, the Office of the Public Defender, particularly me, represented Elizabeth Loper on a new set of charges. And if I may briefly advise the Court on what I understand them to be from the matter of public record which was the affidavit of probable cause. Ms. Loper apparently armed herself with a knife, threatened a co-worker, I believe at some place out here on 13 with a knife because the co-worker was sitting on the washing machine and she had some rather nasty things to say to the co-worker. Definitely a bizarre type of event, I'd have to say.

There is some occasion, also, that

Ms. Loper has been on some anti-psychotic, or

psychotropic medications. I'm not sure what they

might be, the records would reflect that. Those

would be things that I would have, if I were

handling the case, would file a motion to have her examined by a psychiatrist or psychologist to see if, in fact, she was competent to testify. And with her record, probably request to see if she was competent to be a defendant in her other criminal case which is up and coming.

So those are some things that I think the Court needs to look at very carefully, because I'm concerned about -- there are no eyewitnesses in this particular case. There is a police officer who arrived at the scene subsequently who apparently observed what appeared to be a broken front door. But the only evidence to indicate that Mr. Bordley broke the front door and threatened Ms. Loper is from Ms. Loper's own mouth. And this rather lengthy history of mental illness on her part -- or what appears to be mental illness, I think there's some grave concerns there.

I don't know what -- and again, I think
we were talking about making our opening remarks
this afternoon before the Court recessed for Judge
Terry's Memorial Service, but the problem is I'm not
sure, I think there's been a motion in limine, I was

trying to pay attention this morning, but I missed a few things.

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. BAUMEISTER: Motion in limine to preclude me from mentioning that in the opening remarks. But I think that's rather unfair because they might be relevant and there may be some things I want to say to the jury, to listen to her testimony carefully because you will be hearing she is a mental patient.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, what were the two, again, the two motions in limine?

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Your Honor, the first was regarding the victim's, Elizabeth Loper's, pending charge in this court for the aggravated menacing that Mr. Baumeister was just talking about. The State would ask Your Honor to rule that the defendant may make no references to these pending charges as they are not relevant to this matter.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: The second motion was in regard to Ms. Loper's status as a mental patient or as a past mental patient at the Delaware State

2.1

these records are going to show. They may turn out to be completely irrelevant, or they may turn out to have some relevancy; and depending on what decision gets made, it may conceivably affect the way the State presents an opening statement, as well as the way the defense may present an opening statement. It may affect the way the direct examination of the witness is done, as well as the cross-examination of the witness is done.

And so, I think that determination should be made really before we begin. So what this is leading up to is I think we're actually going to start our opening statement and testimony tomorrow at 10 o'clock. I think that's where we are. I'm reluctant to simply deny the request that these records be reviewed, notwithstanding that they were not correctly requested, if you will.

Now, I'm not inclined to continue the case. I'm certainly not going to continue it because of the fact that Mr. Baumeister is now back on the case. I will review these records, but I am not inclined to continue this case to line-up other witnesses, et cetera. I'm inclined to go forward,

relevance now, prior --

MR. BAUMEISTER: It's relevant, Your Honor, to her credibility.

THE COURT: Okay. I will allow the question to be asked and answered, as just stated. Now, once that question has been asked and answered, then where do you seek to go?

MR. BAUMEISTER: Well, then I'm going to go backwards and talk about the particular incidents and other incidents involving these two people within the last year.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we will handle the matter in that fashion. Now, looking ahead, as to these letters that you have mentioned that apparently Mrs. Loper, am I to understand, wrote to Mr. Bordley --

MR. BAUMEISTER: I will be showing

Ms. Loper letters she sent to Mr. Bordley after this

particular event. I have provided copies of those

to the State, and I believe they have reviewed those

letters with Ms. Loper.

THE COURT: These are letters, I take it, which were written between April and July of 1998.

MR. BAUMEISTER: That's correct, as far as I know.

THE COURT: Is the State going to be objecting to questions about those letters?

l

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Your Honor, the State would object to the relevance of any letters that the victim may have written to the defendant, because these letters occurred after the incident we are talking about on January 19th, 1998. These letters, one is a money order and then there are some cards in there, and they are from May. I'm not sure what the date on the last one is, but they look like they are from May, 1998, and the State would question the relevance of these. There is no information in here of no recanting or anything that would be relevant to this trial.

THE COURT: I'm going to want to review those letters before we get on to them. Should I review them now?

MR. BAUMEISTER: Your Honor, I have provided the State with a copy. I have one copy myself and the originals. And quite frankly, I think they are quite relevant to what she testified

1 THE COURT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I didn't write no letters while I was up at the State Hospital.

MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: The letters we are talking about are the ones that we found out -THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

MR. BAUMEISTER: Cards. They are cards, Your Honor.

MR. BAUMEISTER: One's a money order and the others are cards.

THE COURT: Are you Libby?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: What is the relevance of

these?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BAUMEISTER: Your Honor, they go directly to her perceived, I assume, state of mind on January 19th. If, in fact, she was that afraid that this man was going to kill her, then why does she write these letters subsequently and tell him -- one of them says, \*\*To my first love, you will be getting out pretty soon. I'm smoking these nasty ass cobs --" whatever that means "-- for you and me." I'm not exactly sure what she means by that,

and I want to ask her about it. It seems to go to the truthfulness of what she was saying back on January 19th.

THE COURT: Well, it would appear to me that any relevance of these letters -- these are April and May -- it would appear to me that any relevance of these letters is marginal, at most. It would appear to me that they are just not sufficiently relevant to be admitted, and any possible relevance is offset under Rule 403. I'm going to rule them inadmissible under Rule 403.

MR. BAUMEISTER: Your Honor, they go to her credibility. I mean, if you particularly take a look at the one that says. "To my first love, you will be getting out pretty soon. I am smoking these nasty ass cobs for you and me," that goes directly to her credibility, Your Honor. And again, there is no prejudice to her. She's not a defendant in this case. She's merely a witness.

THE COURT: I do not see anything in those letters that has any bearing on her credibility to recount the events of January, 1998.

THE WITNESS: I thought I was the victim

```
1
      here?
 2
                 THE COURT: Well, I'm making evidentiary
      rulings, Mrs. Loper. So you just bear with us here.
 3
 4
      I rule them inadmissible under Rule 403.
 5
                 MR. BAUMEISTER: I take strong exception
 6
     to the Court's ruling.
 7
                 THE COURT: Understood. Understood.
                                                        Are
 8
     we ready to proceed?
 9
                 MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Yes, Your Honor.
10
                 THE COURT: I don't know if Ms. Loper
11
     needs a moment to compose herself.
12
                 THE WITNESS: I'm all right. I'm just
13
     tired of this whole thing. Can we get it over
14
     today?
15
                THE COURT: Pardon me?
16
                THE WITNESS: Can we get all this done by
17
     today?
I 8
                THE COURT: Well, your testimony is
     certainly going to be done today. From what I heard
19
20
     so far, it appears to me that the testimony will all
     be completed today.
21
22
                THE WITNESS: Thank you.
23
                     Jennie L. Washington
                   Official Court Reporter
```

1 of this. I'm not sure if you have ever seen this, 2 but if you could briefly look at it and tell us what 3 your understanding of that is? 4 Yes, I've seen it before. He's not 5 supposed to have no contact with me whatsoever. 6 Q. And by "him," you mean who? 7 Α. Gregory Bordley. 8 MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: Your Honor, the State 9 moves to have this admitted into evidence. 10 MR. BAUMEISTER: I do not object, Your 11 Honor. THE COURT: It's admitted. 12 13 BY MS. WEEKS-TAPPAN: 14 Going back to January 19th, you stated 0. 15 you received a phone call and you told Mr. Bordley 16 not to come over because of this no-contact order 17 that was in place. What did the defendant say to 18 you when you told him not to come over? 19 Α. He said, "Fuck the cops." 20 Q. And did he say anything else after that? 21 Α. No. 22 And did the defendant, in fact, come over Q.

> Jennie L. Washington Official Court Reporter

to your place that evening?

23

	•	Page
(c)	If you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one)	
	Jury □ Judge only □	
Dic	d you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?	
	Yes 🔾 No 🗅	
Dic	d you appeal from the judgment of conviction?	
	Yes 🔾 No 🗅	
If y	ou did appeal, answer the following:	
(a)	Name of court:	
(b)	Docket or case number (if you know):	
(c)	Result:	
	Date of result (if you know):	
(e)	Citation to the case (if you know):	
	Grounds raised:	
(a)	Did you seek further review by a higher state court? Yes \(\sigma\) No \(\sigma\)	
(6)	If yes, answer the following:	
	•	
	(1) Name of court:	
	(3) Result:	
	(4) Date of result (if you know):	
	(5) Citation to the case (if you know):	
	(6) Grounds raised:	
(h) ]	Did you file a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court? Yes 🗀 🗋	10 ⊆
	If yes, answer the following:	
	(1) Docket or case number (if you know):	

		Page
	(2) Result:	
	(3) Date of result (if you know):	
	(4) Citation to the case (if you know):	
10,	Other than the direct appeals listed above, have you previously filed any or	
	applications, or motions concerning this judgment of conviction in any state Yes $\square$ No $\square$	e court?
11.	If your answer to Question 10 was "Yes," give the following information:	
	(a) (1) Name of court:	
	(2) Docket or case number (if you know):	
	(3) Date of filing (if you know):	
	(4) Nature of the proceeding:	
	(5) Grounds raised:	
	(6) Did you receive a hearing where evidence was given on your permotion? Yes O No O	tition, application, or
	(7) Result:	
	(8) Date of result (if you know):	
	(b) If you filed any second petition, application, or motion, give the same in	
	(1) Name of court:	
	(2) Docket or case number (if you know):	
	(3) Date of filing (if you know):	
	(4) Nature of the proceeding:	
	(5) Grounds raised:	

(6) Did you motion?	receive a hearing where evidence was given on your petition, application, or  Yes  No  No
(7) Result:	
	esult (if you know):
	ny third petition, application, or motion, give the same information:
(1) Name of	court;
(2) Docket	case number (if you know):
(3) Date of	ling (if you know):
(4) Nature	the proceeding:
(5) Grounds	raised:
(6) Did you	ecaive a hearing where evidence was given on your netition, application or
motion?	eceive a hearing where evidence was given on your petition, application, or Yes O No O
motion? (7) Result: _	Yes 🗆 No 🗅
motion? (7) Result: _ (8) Date of 1	Yes 🗆 No 🗅
motion?  (7) Result: _  (8) Date of a  Did you appe	Yes 🗆 No 🗅
motion?  (7) Result: _  (8) Date of a  Did you appe	Yes No No No Sesult (if you know):al to the highest state court having jurisdiction over the action taken on you ion, or motion?
motion?  (7) Result: _  (8) Date of r  Did you appoint tition, application application.	Yes No No No Sesult (if you know):al to the highest state court having jurisdiction over the action taken on you ion, or motion?
motion?  (7) Result: _ (8) Date of a  Did you appoint to a  (1) First pe  (2) Second	Yes No No Casult (if you know):  al to the highest state court having jurisdiction over the action taken on you ion, or motion?

12.	For this petition, state every ground on which you claim that you are being held in violation of
	the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have mor
	than four grounds. State the <u>facts</u> supporting each ground.
	CAUTION: To proceed in the federal court, you must ordinarily first exhaust (use up) your
	available state-court remedies on each ground on which you request action by the federal court.
	Also, if you fail to set forth all the grounds in this petition, you may be barred from presenting
	additional grounds at a later date.
GR	OUND ONE:
(a)	Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):
٦١	If you did not subsuch as a first of the sub
(ט	If you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground One, explain why:
c) ]	Direct Appeal of Ground One:
	(1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?
	Yes O No O
	(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:
d) :	Post-Conviction Proceedings:
	(1) Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a
	state trial court? Yes \( \text{Yes} \( \text{No} \( \text{Q} \)
	(2) If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:
	Type of motion or petition:
	Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:

Docket or case number (if you know):
Date of the court's decision:
Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?  Yes □ No □
(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition?  Yes □ No □
(5) If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes." did you raise this issue in the appeal?  Yes  No  No
(6) If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," state:  Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:
Docket or case number (if you know):
Date of the court's decision:
Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
•
(7) If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise issue:
Other Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative nedies, etc.) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground One:
ROUND TWO:
Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim

Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:

	Page		
	Docket or case number (if you know):		
	Date of the court's decision:		
	Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):		
	(7) If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise this issue:		
(e)	Other Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative		
	remedies, etc.) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:		
GR	OUND THREE:		
(a)	Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):		
	•		
_			
(b)	If you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Three, explain why:		
_			
(c)	Direct Appeal of Ground Three:		
	(1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?  Yes □ No □		
	(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:		

(d) Post-Conviction Proceedings:		
(1) Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a		
state trial court? Yes \( \text{No } \text{O} \)  (2) If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:		
Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:		
Docket or case number (if you know):		
Date of the court's decision:		
Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):		
(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?		
Yes O No O		
(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition?  Yes □ No □		
Yes 🗅 No 🗅		
(6) If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," state:		
Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:		
Docket or case number (if you know):		
Date of the court's decision:		
Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):		
(7) If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise th		
issue:		
(a) Other Benedice Describe and the second of the second o		
(e) Other Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative		
remedies, etc.) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Three:		

GF	ROUND FOUR:
_	
(a)	Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):
_	
_	
(b)	If you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Four, explain why:
(c)	Direct Appeal of Ground Four:
	(1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?  Yes □ No □
	(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:
(d)	Post-Conviction Proceedings:
	(1) Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a state trial court? Yes O No O
	(2) If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:  Type of motion or petition:
	Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:
	Docket or case number (if you know):
	Date of the court's decision:
	Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
	(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?  Yes O No O
	(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition?

Page 12

17. Do you have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence for the judgment that you are challenging?

Yes □ No □

	rage I
	(a) If so, give name and location of court that imposed the other sentence you will serve in the future:
	(b) Give the date the other sentence was imposed:
	(c) Give the length of the other sentence:
	(d) Have you filed, or do you plan to file, any petition that challenges the judgment or sentence to
	be served in the future? Yes \( \text{No} \) No \( \text{O} \)
18.	TIMELINESS OF PETITION: If your judgment of conviction became final over one year ago, you
	must explain why the one-year statute of limitations as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) does not bar your petition.*

(continued...)

<sup>\*</sup> The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C.  $\S~2244(d)$  provides in part that:

<sup>(1)</sup> A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of —

	Page 15
Therefore, petitioner asks that the Court grant the	e following relief:
or any other relief to which petitioner may be entit	iled.
	Signature of Attorney (if any)
I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty	of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct
and that this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus w	
(month, date, year)	).
Executed (signed) on (da	te).
	Signature of Petitioner

<sup>\*(...</sup>continued)

<sup>(</sup>A) the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review;

<sup>(</sup>B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action;

<sup>(</sup>C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or

<sup>(</sup>D) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

<sup>(2)</sup> The time during which a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim is pending shall not be counted toward any period of limitation under this subsection.

	Pa	ge 16
•	not petitioner, state relationship to petitioner and explain why petitioner	is
	IN FORMA PAUPERIS DECLARATION	
	[Insert appropriate court]	

## Certificate of Service

I, GREGONT A. BORDLEY,	hereby certify that I have served a true
and correct cop(ies) of the attached: WRIT C	OF Habeas ConPus
and Memorandum of Law	
parties/person (s):	
TO: DISTRICT COURT CLERK  U.S. DISTRICT COURT  844 N. KING ST.  LOCKDOX 18  Wilm. Delaware 19861	DEPT OF JUSTICE  820 N. French ST.  Wilm. Delaware 1986
(CIMI). 37 14 WUIL ( 19/10)	
TO:	TO:
BY PLACING SAME IN A SEALED ENVELOR States Mail at the Delaware Correctional Center, S	
On this 17 day of MaY	, 2005
	<del></del>



DELAWARE CORRECTIONAL CENTER SBI# DOISSOIG UNITD-WES SMYRNA, DELAWARE 19977 1181 PADDOCK ROAD

